

home-grown Iowa chain grocery store. They private-label package this in a 360-milligram package because that is the amount that you can purchase for a single day in Iowa. And you can go out and do that the next day and the next day and the next day in Iowa, or you can go into the pharmacy, in either case, in a monthly supply you can purchase 7,500 milligrams. But in 1 day what I have on display back here, Mr. Speaker, is what I bought in a single day, and all but this from a pharmacy in Cherokee, Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, this represents the pseudoephedrine that you can purchase at one stop, all of these behind me that you can purchase in one stop in Iowa. And that is plenty enough to take care of a family for a good long time.

We have passed some legislation out of the Judiciary Committee today. Instead of limiting it to 360 milligrams a day, it limits it to 3.6 grams or 3,600 milligrams a day. We have a 7,500 milligram per month purchase that we can do in Iowa, but that quantity needs to be purchased from a pharmacist who will watch that volume. The law that passed, the language that passed out of the Judiciary Committee today, that 3.6 grams a day will allow a meth cook to go and make 19 stops around through retail establishments. Now, they sign up each place. They give their ID at each place, but there is not a way to track one retail place to another. So they will go from place to place. They will do 19 stops. They will pick up perhaps 70 grams of pseudoephedrine, go home and make an ounce of methamphetamine and they can get that all done all before noon.

And that ounce of methamphetamine will last one addict 90 days, or their 1-day supply, and then they go sell the 89-day supply, go back again in the afternoon and produce another 90 days' worth of methamphetamine under law that came out of the Judiciary Committee today.

We can do better. I have introduced the Meth Lab Eradication Act. These are the conditions that are part of it. We have set it to comply with Federal law. Schedule 5 drug, penalties are associated with the Schedule 5. This was so easy to adapt to in Iowa with regard to the retailers, the pharmacists and the consumers that the adjustment, according to the author, of this bill was simply pathetically easy. We need to do that in this Congress so we can eradicate meth labs in America.

Mr. Speaker, I promised earlier tonight that I would solve all the world's problems in 60 minutes. And you know, in fact, it is possible, but I did not solve them all tonight. So I am going to pledge to come back and keep working on the world's problems in an optimistic, solution-oriented way. And I appreciate the opportunity to address this Congress.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4241, DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. PUTNAM (during Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-281) on the resolution (H. Res. 542) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4241) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

OUTING OF CIA AGENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the opportunity for the 30-something Working Group to be back in action, and our friend from Iowa has not solved all the world's problems tonight. We will take it from here. We are ready, willing, and able to take the country in a new direction. A couple of the issues that the other side has addressed, one is the meth labs. I had a meeting recently with some sheriff deputies in Trumbull County, Ohio, from Geauga County, Ohio, and Ash-tabula, Ohio, who were saying that they were unable to confiscate the methamphetamine labs because the drug program, the Federal drug task force program has been cut. So maybe we can work together in a bipartisan way to try to increase the funding for that, and you will be supportive, I am sure, so that we can make sure we crack down on these methamphetamine labs. This is something that we want to do.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the other side brought up the fact that a CIA agent was outed, and there was some disagreement. The prosecutor here, Mr. Fitzgerald, said that the reason Scooter Libby was not charged with outing a CIA agent is because he lied so much to the grand jury that he could not prove it. And he used the example, he said that I am like the umpire. I am the Federal prosecutor. I am the umpire. And as I was trying to make a decision here of whether or not he outed the CIA agent, Scooter Libby threw sand in my eyes. So I was not able to get to the point where I could actually charge him with outing a CIA agent because he threw sand in my eyes.

So he charged him with two counts of making false statements to a Federal agent, two counts of perjury to a grand jury, and one count of obstruction of justice. And how the other side could somehow say that that is all right, that is okay, I cannot believe that they would just charge him with that. You just lied to a grand jury? That was all you did? Okay. Well, that is all right. You did not out a CIA agent, or at least

we could not prove it. And before we get going here, there are some CIA agents, former covert operatives that I think would disagree.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Those are third-party validators that were actually CIA agents. Am I correct, sir?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is absolutely right. Here is one CIA agent, Jim Marcinkowski. This was on "60 Minutes." He says exposing Brewster-Jennings, let me give a little background here. When Joe Wilson's wife was outed, when it became public, the world all of a sudden knew that everyone she was associated with and affiliated with was a part of the CIA in some way, shape or form, and so they also outed Brewster-Jennings, which was a front company, CIA front company in Boston, not to mention the 20 years' worth of contacts that also got outed.

But here is a quote from Jim Marcinkowski on "60 Minutes," a former covert CIA agent. He said exposing the Boston firm Brewster-Jennings could lead foreign intelligence agencies to other spies. There is a possibility that there were other agents that would use the same kind of a cover so they may have been using Brewster-Jennings just like her. Another one from The Washington Post, a small Boston company, listed as Valerie Plame's employer, suddenly was shown to be a bogus CIA front and her alma mater in Belgium discovered it was a favored haunt of an American spy.

By Karl Rove and Scooter Libby and the executive branch outing Joe Wilson's wife, they put a lot of people in jeopardy, and they hurt our intelligence capabilities all over the world because now people who have dealt with Americans who went to the University of Belgium or who had dealings with Brewster-Jennings are now being looked upon as suspect.

Not only that, the word now is that the spouses of American ambassadors are being looked at suspiciously because now people think just because Valerie Plame was the spouse of an American ambassador and she was a CIA agent that every other spouse of an ambassador all over the world may be a CIA agent. This has ramifications, Mr. Speaker, that we do not even realize yet. And that has done nothing but weaken the country.

Now, here is the ultimate third-party validator on why the corruption going on in the White House right now must stop, because it is hurting our ability to fight the war on terrorism. They are weakening our ability to fight this war. This is Melissa, who was a 14-year covert CIA operative, and she was asked a question on "60 Minutes." She says because we are talking about lives, and we are talking about capabilities, we do our work. We risk our own lives. We risk the lives of our agents in order to protect our country. And when something like this happens, it cuts to the very core of what we do. We are not being undermined by the

North Koreans. We are not being undermined by the Russians. We are being undermined by officials in our own government. That I find galling.

Mr. Speaker, to come to the floor, for our Republican friends to come to this floor and to somehow defend this is crazy.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is outrageous. I would be happy to yield.

MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Because, you know, I think most people would understand why a CIA agent, a fellow CIA agent, would be outraged at the conduct coming from the Vice President's chief of staff, that he would do anything that would potentially put their lives or the lives of their colleagues in jeopardy. So some people might say, well, of course that would upset other CIA agents, and of course they would think that that was a problem. But in the spirit of continuing our desire to demonstrate that this is not just our opinion, and that we have some other third-party validators who agree, let us look at what Ed Gillespie, who is the chairman of the Republican National Committee, said.

He was speaking to Chris Matthews on "Hardball," and Chris Matthews asked him what he thought of it. And his comment to Chris Matthews then was that I think if the allegation is true, to reveal the identity of an undercover CIA operative is abhorrent, and it should be a crime and it is a crime. And then Chris Matthews went on to ask Chairman Gillespie, he said, it would be worse than Watergate, would it not? And Gillespie's response was, Yeah, I suppose in terms of the real world implications of it, it is not just politics.

I mean, if that is not the ultimate third-party validator saying that it is abhorrent and it should be a crime and it is a crime to reveal the identity of an undercover CIA operative. Now, let us just make sure we say that Mr. Libby has only been accused of conduct related to that likelihood, not convicted of that. So, you know, of course we want to remember that this is a democracy and in our democracy you are innocent until proven guilty. However, it is really deeply disturbing that this is the first time in 130 years, 130 years, that we have had a White House official indicted on anything, never mind betrayal of this country's deepest secrets. And we have a long list of people who have commented on that possibility. We also have in the White House, still, I mean, Scooter Libby has left. Scooter Libby has now resigned from the White House. But you still have Karl Rove there in the White House as the right hand of the President with full, the highest level of security clearance.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Deputy chief of staff.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Deputy chief of staff.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. He is the deputy chief of staff in the White House, in the West Wing.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. He has multiple titles, actually. I know that he has more than just that one title. And the President has not dismissed him or asked him to step aside.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Why is that? Can I ask, can we have a discussion here, a serious discussion, you know, at 11 o'clock at night? Why would the President not fire him?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You know, let us just give them the benefit of doubt. Let us say we did not think the President should fire him. We do, but let us say, why has the President not suspended him at least until he called upon even the White House council to do an internal investigation? They are really good at copping to internal investigations and not allowing independent investigations of wrongdoing or potential wrongdoing. But he has not even suggested that his duties should be suspended so that you can clear the cloud away.

□ 2300

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Maybe we should clear up exactly what happened here. In the indictment on or around June 12 or 13, Karl Rove told "Scooter" Libby about Joe Wilson's wife. On or about June 12 Karl Rove told Libby about Joe Wilson's wife and that Bob Novak was going to probably write an article about it. So Rove was tipping off Libby that this article was going to be in the paper and we need to deal with this somehow. That was in June.

On September 14, Karl Rove tells ABC News that he does not even know who Joe Wilson is or his wife or anything else. And then 2 years later, I think it may have been last summer, he reiterates the fact.

Okay, so we have Karl Rove telling Libby one thing about Valerie Plame and then telling the American people a few months later he does not know anything about it. That is why Karl Rove is no longer fit to serve the American public because he did not lie to ABC News. He did not lie to CNN. Karl Rove lied to the American people. Period. Dot. End of story. And he tried to revise, he tried to recant but he just cannot do it. This is the fact.

The indictment says he lied to the American people. He needs to be fired. I mean, no one here would accept that from their staff.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If I can, can I just be the majority right now?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would love for the gentleman to be the majority right now.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Can I role play for a minute for the Republican majority?

What they are doing in response here in this House to what the gentleman has just pointed out that is public record, third-party validator, using the very words of these individuals. This is what the majority is doing.

We read it in the paper. We are hearing it on the news. People all over the world are talking about these allegations. The indictment has quotes of individuals where they contradict one another as it relates to the outing of a CIA agent, but they are my friends. And even though they are not from my district and they did not vote for me, I have their back.

Whatever the Democrats say and whatever they may write, or the ranking member of said committee of oversight that wants to review national security clearances for these individuals, I will do nothing to help in that environment to be able to bring about protection of national security clearance credentials for individuals that are questioned in these allegations. Not only will I not talk about it, I will not even have a hearing on it. As a matter of fact, I will not even allow a hearing on it.

We would come to the floor and we would say, it is just the Democrats once again being negative, not being productive. All they can do is talk about things that are not of any consequence to national security.

Now, that is what they are doing. That is what they are doing. If you ask the majority about oversight, you heard in the last hour we had a couple of hours ago, I read the record under the Clinton administration, 1,089 subpoenas of the Clinton administration for far less, for far less.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. How many under this administration?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. At that particular time only 11 subpoenas for Republicans. Under this administration, we are still getting that information. Far less. The Republican-controlled Congress, thousands upon thousands of hours of staff interviews of Clinton administration officials.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. \$40-some million.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Millions of dollars of taxpayer dollars, and we have the outing of a CIA agent. We have an indictment for the first time in years.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. One hundred thirty years.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. One hundred thirty years of a White House Chief of Staff of the Vice President of these United States indicted. We have an Official A that we now know as the Senior Chief of Staff or Assistant Chief of Staff to the President of these United States, and not a mumbling word. Not one floor speech. Not one letter. Not one hearing in the people's House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. No outrage, no floor speeches, no 1-minutes, no 5-minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No message meeting from the Republican Conference about we need to make sure that we stand up to our constitutional responsibilities.

So when we talk about a culture of corruption and cronyism and incompetence, that is not what we are saying. That is what the American people are thinking and what they know. That

is the reason why this Congress has between a 35 percent approval rating to 31 percent approval rating. It is not our doing. It is the doing of the majority that are not doing their job.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Almost 60 percent of the American people believe that Karl Rove needs to resign, 60 percent. This is not me or my colleagues or the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), who failed a little bit on us tonight. We tried to squeeze him into the 30-something Group. We tried to help him out, then he faded on us, got a little sleepy, started yawning. We had to dismiss him.

But here it is. There is a poll. This is a Washington Post poll in November of 2004. Fifty-nine percent of people in this country believe Karl Rove needs to resign.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Does the gentleman remember when we were growing up, it seemed like any time you turned on C-SPAN or there was a shot of the Congress doing something, when we were kids, it was a shot of the Congress in a hearing, the Iran Contra hearings or some kind of investigatory hearing that would immediately be called. The ink on the accusation would not be dry before congressional hearings were called to investigate.

Am I missing something? Maybe I am not in the loop.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Article 1, section 1 of the United States Constitution creates this Chamber right here, the people's House. And we have oversight of everything else that happens in the government, over the executive, over all the agencies, the Cabinet, departments and everything else. This is the people's House.

And as my friend from Florida likes to say, you cannot get appointed to this House. You have to run if I pass out here and I die.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We do not want that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I do not want that either. I am not ready. But if I pass out here and I die, the Governor in Ohio will call a special election and people will run for my seat and have to get elected here. That is the bottom line. This is the people's House. We directly represent the people in our district. And we have the ability in this Chamber to oversee every other aspect of the government.

But our Republican friends refuse to investigate the CIA leak. They refuse to have an independent or create an independent investigation. This has become so political here that we cannot get straight answers on how to fix the way our government runs.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me just, like we say, put the cookie on the bottom shelf here.

Veterans Day is Friday. I am just thinking about this. Folks have put statements in the RECORD. Our veterans, we love them, tear drops on the paper while they are writing it. And here we are living in an environment now in the 109th Congress, Republican-

controlled Congress, where it has been proven, literally put on paper to be judged in a court of law that officials in the White House several years ago, someone finally came forth and told the truth or said that someone lied. And they have the power to call these White House officials in a public hearing to talk about what happened. They have the power to do that, but they choose not to.

Now, just like I have this mike here and this podium, there will be some Members of Congress that will be asked to speak at a Veterans Day event and they are going to talk about the war on terror. And they are going to talk about winning the hearts and minds of Iraqis and other groups that are out there. And they are going to talk about the troops and their commitment. But I tell you one thing that they will not talk about. They will not talk about the fact that we know what is going on.

We are not going to call these people before Congress and ask questions like we are supposed to when CIA agents are outed, when national security is jeopardized. We are not going to, when there is almost close to prima facie evidence that it jeopardized national security as it relates to a person's job, who was to find out and seek out those countries that have weapons of mass destruction for the reason that we went to war in the first place.

I am just in the middle of what they are doing or not doing.

By the way, I want to let you know that I have voted to make sure that you veterans of wars that allow me to go into a free House in the Congress to represent you, that I have voted to increase your copayments. I voted to make sure that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs over the next 5 years makes \$798 million in cuts that very well will result in two things: one, making sure that you pay higher fees when you go to the Veterans Affairs Department for a death benefit, or make sure that you wait longer to see a specialist in the Veterans' Department and clinics and hospitals.

That will not be said. That will not be shared with those veterans. But I guarantee you, as we sit here, letter after letter after letter from these groups that are saying that they are against what this Republican majority is doing. So when we see what is public knowledge here in the United States and throughout the world, that it is okay as long as it is the Republican White House and the Republican Congress that is condoning it to happen.

In the Senate, in the Senate I am so glad that the Democratic leadership used Rule 21 to call them into a closed session, to force the Republican majority to come with Democrats and Republicans, three on each side, to finish looking into the allegations of false information given to the Congress when it was time to go to war.

So when we start talking about the budget and we start talking about corruption and cronyism, it is happening

in the moment. And I am so glad that I am a part of a party and have leadership that is willing to stand up on behalf of the American people.

Guess what? There are some of my Republican friends, because I talked to them, and when I say they are my friends, they are my friends. They wake up and put their pants on one leg at a time or grab their purse or what have you; and they are good people. But it is the leadership. That is the reason why the votes are extended.

I have here, right here in my hand, it is called The House Rules and Manual of the 109th Congress. In this manual, I must add that it says, under rule 20, Mr. Speaker, and it is number 2 here, it talks about the fact that the maximum time for a recorded vote or quorum call by electronic device shall be 15 minutes.

□ 2315

Now, as I stand here as Carrie Meek's son, my mother, I guarantee you tomorrow when this vote comes up that the spirit of that rule will not prevail. We will be here for some time because they have to convince some of our friends in the majority to vote for the rule.

We can talk about that a little bit because I think we need to share that with the Members, Mr. Speaker, of what the Rules Committee did tonight. I think we need to talk about that since it was in a dark room on the third floor. We are on the second floor now. It was on the third floor of this very building.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. While you are on the rule, about an hour ago, the Rules Committee reported a rule which are the directions that are given to the House for legislation that we consider each day. The Rules Committee gives us the parameters under which we can operate and act on each bill.

So, the rule for tomorrow that has come out on a party-line vote for this budget reconciliation bill tomorrow, is called a closed rule. You may be asking, well, what is a closed rule, what does that mean? A lot of the terms we use in Washington are cryptic.

A closed rule means that no one can offer any amendments to this bill. We will have, using the term that people have heard so often, an up-or-down vote on this budget reconciliation bill.

A short time ago, I recall that one of the distinguished members of the Rules Committee was discussing with us how open the process is and how much input we as Democrats in the minority party have had in the process and how many amendments we have been able to get in and have considered.

This document, this bill, that we are considering tomorrow is perhaps the most important piece of legislation which will have the most far-reaching impact of almost anything that we are going to consider in this Congress: \$844 million in food stamps, eliminating 300,000 people off of food stamp rolls,

cutting child care, \$17.5 billion in financial assistance to college students. The list goes on and on, and the Republican leadership, because we have got to call it like it is, created a closed rule so that we cannot offer any changes to that bill tomorrow, none. That is the democracy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One of the things, among others, what we would try to do, as we try to reconcile the budget, is not give \$70 billion in tax cuts that go primarily to the people who make more than half a million dollars a year.

The whole idea of this whole thing was to somehow find in the budget \$50 billion to pay for Katrina, and instead, they found the \$50 billion to pay for Katrina supposedly, but they also gave \$70 billion in tax cuts, which means their deficit, this is what is great about Washington, their deficit reduction package actually increases the deficit by \$20 billion because they just cannot resist giving people who make more than \$500,000 i.e., their campaign contributors, a tax cut.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Could I ask a question?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Sure.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I think it is always helpful for us to provide information to people who do not really know much about this process here. It is kind of arcane. Maybe you could help describe for people who are wondering about the process, we have to name each piece of legislation, so that it is descriptive for the membership.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Supposed to be. The words at the top are supposed to identify what is happening.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Ideally, it is actually supposed to define what we are doing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You would think a deficit reduction bill would reduce the deficit.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes, of course. The name of this legislation is the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. I am a freshman and I do not know the rules in that book as well as the two of you or as well as some of my senior colleagues. So I wonder if there is anything in the book, the rules book, that says you cannot be inaccurate or misleading.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Let us be a little more specific. Maybe the 30 Something Working Group will offer an amendment to the House rules to say that a bill specifically called the Deficit Reduction Act.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Actually has to reduce the deficit.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yeah.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Why would you want to do that?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Let us try.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. All right. Here is a perfect example of what we call the Potomac 2-Step. You have just outlined a perfect example. Some may say hoodwink. Others may say bamboozle. But here in Washington we call it Potomac 2-Step. It is a dance where, hey, I am going this way, you go that way, you swing your arms.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. They call it the bootleg: fake left, go around the other side.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me just tell you what they are doing.

Presently, they would say it is reducing the deficit, but what they are not saying within another 2 weeks, we are going to give people that make over half a million dollars a year the biggest tax cut they have ever seen. One Member described it on that side as we are going to help the productive people here in the United States; we are going to help the productive people. So I guess that means, American worker, if you make between \$34,000 and \$54,000 and you get an \$840 tax cut, you are not necessarily in that group of the half a million folks.

I want you to go further on that chart, but just before we get too far away from what the Rules Committee did tonight on a party-line vote, you hear Members come to the floor and other Members say, oh, well, we are for fairness; we do not know why the Democrats will not offer their alternatives; they have nothing but complaints; it is almost un-American.

I am going to tell you what is un-American, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to tell you what is limiting the voice of the Democratic side over here.

The rule that was passed from the Rules Committee just moments ago in darkness, there was not a television camera in that room. When we start talking about the back halls of Congress, it is our job here in the 30 Something Working Group, good or bad, we are supposed to expose what happens in the back halls of Congress.

Let me just read this. This is not something that I printed. This is what the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) just pointed out on H.R. 4241, what they call the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, even though it is increasing the deficit by \$20 billion and change. I did not put these in order.

Number 1, closed rule. Closed rule means that we cannot even offer an amendment to this Act when it comes to the floor, democrat or Republican. Let me just keep going here. This gets interesting.

Two, provides 2 hours of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget. That is where the Republican side gets two hours to talk about how good it is, the Democrats get 2 hours to talk about why we cannot offer anything to this budget, why are we cutting veteran benefits, why we are increasing student loan costs to students for our next generation of workers in this country, why can we not have more female engineers in this country, why are we putting what I call tax, they call fee, why are we putting additional tax on American families to educate their children.

Three, waive all points of order against consideration of the bill. Well, goodness gracious.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What does that mean?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That means if you have a point of order to the Speaker, that is waived, you are out of order. What do you mean point of order? If something was found in the rule book tomorrow that violates the rules of this House and I want to make a point of order, you cannot make it because it has been waived by the Rules Committee.

Number 4, provides that all amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution shall be considered as adopted.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Without a vote?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Without a vote. Should be considered as adopted. That means it is already adopted. What are they meeting for? What is the 2 hours on both side? Why debate it? We did it because we are in the majority, and guess what, we have the power to do that. They are setting the rules. They think they are muzzling the Democratic side. They are muzzling the people that sent us up here to represent them. That is what they are doing. That is the reason why this stuff happens at night here.

Number 5, this is not my order, Mr. Speaker. This is from the Rules Committee. Waive all points of order against provisions in the bill as amended. They have already, in their opinion, adopted this bill. When I say "they," I am talking about the Republican majority. When we talk about power, when we talk about an abuse of power, Mr. Speaker, that is what we are talking about.

I want to say it again, just in case someone missed it. This is not what we are doing, Mr. Speaker. This is what the Republican majority is doing on the Rules Committee.

Number 6, provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Now, is that an opportunity for us to amend the bill or change it?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What does that let us do?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is just an attempt by the individuals that have problems with this bill to recommit it back to committee. I mean, this is not something to change or improve or someone comes to the floor and say, you know, if you just did not do what you are doing to free and reduced lunch for children, poor children in my community, I just cannot vote for this because I just cannot close a clinic which is only open in my rural area once every 2 weeks and now this may very well close it; all these billions of dollars in cuts to the veterans assistance and health care and death benefit, I just cannot vote for it in good conscience. So that means that that cannot even happen.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Can I ask you another question on that point. In the time that you have been

here, which is 3 years now, has a motion to recommit ever passed out of the House of Representatives since you have been here?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No, no. It does not happen.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. So they never send a bill back to committee even if something may be wrong with it?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No.

Number 7, provides that notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker. Now, that is the out in number 7, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, in no way do I want to see the American people go through what the majority wants them to go through if this bill passes hypothetically tomorrow.

That allows the Republican majority to say, oh, the leadership, goodness, we could not get some of our Members to vote against their own constituents that sent them up here; we tried but it just could not happen because it was the wrong thing to do. They thought about it. Some slept on it. Some got calls from their veterans and from faith-based organizations that do what they can do on behalf of those that do not have as much as others; those that were concerned about the effects on the environment that is in this budget; those that cared about children to have an education environment, Mr. Speaker, where you do not have kids on one end that had breakfast, lunch and dinner because their families were able to provide it versus those kids that could have been stricken by natural disaster or a father could have died or under this bill a single mother because we cut child enforcement dollars to help go after deadbeat parents that are not paying for it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Can I say something. What we are trying to do here is move away from a country that says if you are born in the right neighborhood, with the right family, you are going to be fine, and if you are not born in the right neighborhood to the right family, the heck with you. That is what this is all about. I mean, if we have got to boil this down 30-Something-style and lay it out there, that is what it is. You cannot cut Medicaid. You cannot cut food stamps, foster care, child support enforcement, raise the fees on student loans.

□ 2330

What are we doing? This does not make any sense. We are a bit younger, on average, than most Members here, but this makes no sense. I do not know any other way to say it than this is crazy, what we are doing here. This makes no sense, at the same time we are giving half a million people, making half a million more here, huge tax cuts.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It is not what we are doing, it is what the majority is doing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is late, and I appreciate my colleague correcting me.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It is not what we are doing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is what we are fighting against.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It is what we are fighting against. And guess what? Those that come to the floor, and I guarantee there will be some come to the floor, and someone will give them a piece of paper, and they will say, Okay, thank you, and they will run up here, grab the mike and they will say, Why do the Democrats not offer something?

Hello? The Rules Committee has spoken. It is done. Period. Dot. Even if someone had a great idea, they cannot do it. And there is a history of this kind of abuse here in the House and muzzling individuals and people with great ideas that want to help this country. But, better yet, the rule.

And this is America. This is not a Third World country. This is not a Communist country. This is America.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I want to elaborate on what my colleague is saying, because some people might think that this is unusual and that it is a rare occurrence that they would close a bill and not allow us to offer any amendments. This is just my first year, but I wanted to just check on what the Republican leadership's track record is in terms of allowing us the input that they say they so desperately want us to provide.

There have been about 85 bills, as of last Thursday, which was November 3, 85 bills that we have considered on this floor that were amendable. There are lots of bills we consider that are under what is called the suspension calendar, and we vote those up or down. Those are the noncontroversial bills. But 85 bills.

Of the 85 bills that were potentially amendable, 38 of them were given restrictive rules where there were severe limitations on the amendments that were allowed to be offered. Severe. Fifteen of those bills were closed, like the one that we are considering tomorrow, meaning no additional amendments were allowed. No amendments at all were allowed. Plus three additional closed rules that were included in another bill.

Now, there have been, of the 85, 12 open rules, meaning anyone can offer an amendment, but 11 of those were appropriations bills, spending bills, which we always are allowed to offer amendments to.

So what it boils down to, and 10 were conference reports and 10 were procedural. But what that boils down to is that since I was elected and have served in Congress 11 months, we have had one bill, one substantive bill, that had an open rule, one where we could offer any idea we wanted.

Now, my colleague from Florida talked earlier about how we all put our pant legs on one at a time. And I wear pants and sometimes I wear skirts, and sometimes I wear pajamas. I might be

bringing those tomorrow because we are not sure how long we are going to be here and how long they are going to hold that vote open until they get their way. But we were also all elected by the same number of people, or we certainly represent the same number of people, the same 633,000 people. But we are not all treated equally in this Chamber, because on our side of the aisle we are not allowed to provide the input that they say they want us to provide.

I actually just want to, if you do not mind, tell a little story, because we should demonstrate what is going on here in this bill tomorrow. Gene Sperling, who was at one time President Clinton's top economic adviser, he compared this budget and the cutting in the budget to cutting only peanut butter. I will share this story with you. Imagine the following:

The father of a financially stretched family decides to live it up. He leases three fully loaded Hummer H1s for the bargain price of \$9,750 a month, almost \$10,000. As the family's financial situation deteriorates, the father calls the family together for a belt-tightening discussion. He holds up a jar of Whole Foods chunky peanut butter and says, Do you realize we are spending \$4.49 on this? We could be saving \$2.04 if we bought Skippy Peanut Butter for only \$2.45.

His teenage son responds, like, Dad, man, why are you busting on us about two bucks on peanut butter when you are spending like almost \$10,000 a month on cars?

Then the father responds, Do not change the subject. We are talking about peanut butter.

Well, that is essentially what the leadership is saying by giving tax cuts to millionaires and the greedy, their cronies, and cutting programs for veterans, children, and the poor who are the needy. They are basically saying, We need to talk about the peanut butter, that is all that matters to us.

In some of the time we have left, we should let people know just exactly what the conscience vote is tomorrow, so that people know when we all go to sleep tonight just who is going to be able to wake up and look at themselves in the mirror and hold their head up high. We are being asked tomorrow to vote to cut \$844 million from food stamps. They say there is fraud in the food stamp program and that we need to reduce waste.

Well, I held up this picture earlier tonight, and I will hold it up again, because I think it is very descriptive. There is the picture of the 25,000 people who lined up in Broward County today to apply for food stamps after getting hit by Hurricane Wilma. They started lining up at 3 a.m. They did not line up for emergency funding.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Those are new people. Those are not people who were probably on food stamps.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. These are new people. The vast majority of

people in this line were applying for the first time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And there are a lot of other people in the country because the poverty rate has gone so high.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And this does not come from FEMA money. This is not the emergency funding. This comes right out of the food stamp program.

We have cuts in child care. We have cuts that would prevent us from ensuring that deadbeat dads are pursued. There is a \$4.9 billion cut from child support programs. As a result, parents will receive \$7.1 billion, as the chart points out, less in child support over 5 years and \$21.3 billion less over 10 years.

There is a \$577 million cut from foster care. Now, I know there are colleagues of mine on the other side of the aisle who are just bristling at that possibility. They do not want to make it so that families cannot take children in.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are not kidding here either. If you are watching at home, you might think these guys are out there telling a story.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. This is real.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is real stuff. It is why we are up at 11:35 at night talking about it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. My colleagues, it is not only what we are saying, it is what is in House Resolution 4241. You can go on line, Members that have not taken a look at that, they can look in the morning, read over it, have staff highlight exactly, verbatim, what we are talking about here.

I know the reason why the Rules Committee, Republican majority, closed the rule. I know why they did it. Because on this side of the aisle we will do what we tried to do in the Budget Committee. We will replace the cuts that they made to veterans' services and health care. We will replace that.

And guess what? Under the lights and in this Chamber they would have to go up, take my voting card out, they would have to go up to the machines that we have here and actually take out their voting card and put it in the machine and go on the record, on the board, saying that they are willing to cut child support enforcement.

I wonder what their State attorneys are going to say and district attorneys are going to say when a single parent, nine times out of ten women, that are going to go into the State attorney's office and prosecutor's office and say, he ran out on me; he left me here with these four kids. I have not seen him and he has not given a dime towards child support. Can you help me?

Yes, they will take their information. But you know what they will say? Ma'am, I am sorry, it is going to probably take 3 years because we have a backlog because of our friends in Congress. You need to call your Congressman because they cut the child enforcement money.

But it gets worse, Mr. Speaker. The three of us were members of the State legislatures. Mr. RYAN was in the senate in Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and myself, we were in the senate in Florida and in the house. My colleague from Florida speaks of the fact that she is a freshman here, but her public service goes beyond mine. I have been here 11 years, and I met her when I came into the house because she was already there a term before me.

So what is going to happen when it gets to the State legislatures? What are they going to do, Mr. Speaker? They are going to make a cut, too, to child support enforcement.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They will not have a choice.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. They will not have a choice because we handed it to them. We gave it to them.

So the Republican majority once again uses this book. And the power that they have on the majority side to close the rule, the power the people gave to them, is to prevent us from saying, Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk that will replace the cuts that are made to veterans, that will replace the cuts made to child enforcement. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk that will make sure that those oil companies that are celebrating historic record profits, that we not only talk about those record profits here in Congress, that we do something about it; and we make sure that those who cannot afford heating oil and LP gas this winter can receive a break on that. They stopped that from happening.

So when you start talking about where are the Democrats, where are their ideas? Well, guess what? We are not going to tell you that last night at 10 p.m., while some of you all were home asleep, we got them good. We shut them down. We put forth a rule that they cannot even introduce their ideas. And you know why they did it? Because they might very well have lost some of their Members, who would have had to take this card out and put it in these machines behind these chairs and vote for their constituents and the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The American people did not give the Republican Party the power that they have to use it to suppress good ideas or to suppress other Americans' voices.

So the question may be, as we are talking about the closed rule and all the parliamentary procedures used here to shut down Democrats, many people would be saying, Well, what would you offer?

Well, a couple of things I can think of off the top of my head, one of the amendments we would offer on this floor is to strip the \$16 billion that we are giving right now to the oil companies in corporate welfare. We would take that back. The Democrats, Mr. Speaker, would offer an amendment to repeal the \$16 billion.

And the Democrats would offer an amendment on this floor tomorrow

during the budget debate to pull back the prescription drug Medicare Part D and put in the bill a provision to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate down the drug prices.

We would also put in there that we would allow reimportation to drive the costs down. We would save the American taxpayer, with just those two or three amendments tomorrow, billions and billions and billions of dollars. And probably, over the course of the next few years, we would be able to pay for Katrina and be able to invest in our students through the Pell Grant and the student loan, and be able to make sure that every child has adequate health care.

That is what we would offer. So if you are sitting at home paying attention to this debate, those are a couple of the basic things the Democrats would do.

I yield to my colleague.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank my colleague. And there is good news in all of this sadness. And that is the best word I can apply to this piece of garbage that we are going to consider tomorrow. There is good news, because the voters get it. They know this country should be turned around and moved in a new direction, and they sent a very strong message yesterday.

We had a number of elections across this country yesterday, and in every single one that rose and fell on issues like these, who won? The Democrats won. We will have a Democratic governor of Virginia, we will have a Democratic governor of New Jersey. All eight initiatives in California that would have abused the process, abused democracy, that would have harmed people had they passed in California, which were initiated by Republican Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, were repudiated by the voters of California. All eight were defeated.

□ 2345

So it is very clear that the American people are rejecting their agenda and want to go in a new direction.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We have the new ideas to take the country in a new direction and get away from this corruption and the cronyism of hiring friends to run major organizations like FEMA.

How rotten is the system, how corrupt is a system that the Republican majority will not go to the wealthiest people, will not go to the oil companies or the pharmaceutical companies to pay for Hurricane Katrina or invest in the student aid and those kinds of things because they need the money for their campaign contributions. That is a corrupt system. That is what we want to change.

We want to move away from that and allow this body to once again become the independent body that it should be, that the Founding Fathers wrote up Article I, Section 1 in the Constitution providing the oversight for the executive branch, like the Republican majority has shown they know how to do.

They did not do it for a great reason. They did it to get into the personal life of President Clinton.

But now we have public violations, violations of the public trust through CIA leaks, leaks of CIA prisons, and all of this nonsense that has been going on. Let us restore some integrity back to this place and get rid of the three C's: corruption, cronyism, and the lack of competence.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to read Point No. 4. This paper is still a little warm because they just carried out this act. It states: "Provide that the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution shall be considered as adopted."

Why come to the floor tomorrow? We cannot offer an amendment.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. People are going to make career decisions tomorrow.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Yes, that is the bottom line. Some Member is going to make a career decision tomorrow because somebody told him to vote for something that they did not want to vote for in the first place.

We are going to make the right decisions, decisions on behalf of the American people. May the blocks fall where they may. There is going to be a difference between the Members and the followers in this Chamber. It is important that we let the American people know who is standing for them.

So when Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ talks about when judgment day comes every 2 years, when Democrats, Republicans and the one Independent we have, when people go to make their decision, I want them to think about the fact that they should vote principle over party. Do not go for, in the last minute what we call in some areas of this country, the okie-doke. Hey, I am strong on terror. I am with the trips. We have Members flying to Iraq. Thank you for fighting for our country; but do not talk to me when you become a veteran. I am just fresh off a vote cutting your future benefits. But, hey, I am with you all of the way. But as long as you stay enlisted, we stay with you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give the Web site out, but I wanted to make that point so people remember what happened this November. They came to the floor and came willing to vote for a budget that was unjust.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Web site is

30SomethingDems@mail.house.gov. Send an e-mail recommendation to the Members of this body tomorrow. And bring your PJ pants. We may be here into the wee hours of the morning. We want to apologize in advance to the veterans organizations we are supposed to be at Friday morning for speaking engagements because we may be here voting on this budget.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 2:00 p.m.

Mr. CONAWAY (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today and November 10 on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KIND) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2490. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 West Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the "Mayor Joseph S. Daddona Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3339. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2061 South Park Avenue in Buffalo, New York, as the "James T. Molloy Post Office Building".

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on November 4, 2005, he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 2744. Making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2967. To designate the Federal Building located at 333 Mt. Elliott Street in De-

troit, Michigan, as the "Rosa Parks Federal Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 10, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5083. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emerald Ash Borer; Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 05-067-1] received November 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5084. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the differing Army and Air Force policies for taking adverse administrative actions against National Guard officers in a State status and a determination as to whether changes are needed in those policies, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 104 note Public Law 107-314 section 511(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5085. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William Welser III, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5086. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Philip R. Kensinger, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5087. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Walter E. Buchanan III, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5088. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Michael W. Peterson, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10 United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5089. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Lieutenant General William T. Hobbins, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5090. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Michael D. Maples, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10 United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5091. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Rear